

SESSION #8
 2017-12-11
 FM2-123

1. Review: Contrasting AV and PV

- What are the morphosyntactic signals that indicate voice?

- (1a) Aku janjiq dagang no kèpèng
 'I promised the seller money'
 -straightforward AV construction, with no clitics
- (1b) janjiq=ku dagang no kèpèng
 'I promised the seller money'
 -When the A is cliticized, the only signal that you are not in PV is there's no *siq*-phrase
- (1c) siq=ku janjiq dagang no kèpèng
 'I promised the seller money'
 -Here the clear *siq*-phrase indicates PV
- (2a) Aku wah janjiq dagang no kèpèng
 'I promised the seller money'
 -again, straightforward AV construction
- (2b) wah=ku janjiq dagang no kèpèng
 'I promised the seller money'
 -Again, when the A is cliticized, the only signal that you are not in PV is there's no *siq*-phrase
- (3a) wah=ne janjiq dagang no kèpèng
 'He promised the seller money'
 -Most likely a PV construction. Again, when the A is cliticized, the only signal that you are not in PV is there's no *siq*-phrase
- (3b) Siq=ne janjiq dagang no kèpèng
 'He promised the seller money'
 -Here we have the clear PV variant of (3a): We have a *siq*-phrase at the beginning of the utterance, without the optional *siq*-phrase at the end with the full NP. Nisa says "that's the same sentence" as (3a)

2. Differences in interpreting fronted R and T in PV, AV

- (4a) dagang no janjiq=ne kèpèng siq Udin
 'Udin promised the seller money'
 -Here is a clear PV construction, with the R fronted. Nisa did not object to this construction at all.
- (4b) Dagang no janjiq=ku kèpèng

'It's the seller that I promised money'

-Here the R is fronted in AV, with the agent again cliticized to the verb. I think this is AV for two reasons: 1) There's no *siq*-phrase, although that's not rock-solid evidence of voice, and 2) Most importantly, fronting the R in AV forces a different interpretation from PV. In fact, when I had this originally translated as 'I promised the seller money', Nisa dispreferred that translation and immediately interpreted the sentence as topicalizing the seller

(5a) *kèpèng janjiq=ne dagang no siq Udin*

'Udin promised the seller money'

-T is fronted here, similarly to R in (4a). Again, because it's PV there is no necessary topicalization reading

(5b) *kèpèng janjiq=ku dagang no*

'It's money that I promised the seller'

-but when you front the T in AV, as with the R in (4b), you get a topicalized construction

3. **Passivization:** Can R and T passivize in other underived ditransitives?

-looks like passivization of R and T is pretty straightforward for *janjiq* and *towoq*. It's also OK for *peritoq*, but things there are complicated a bit by the preference for -an and the addition of the A in a *siq*-phrase. Nonetheless, both R and T can be passivized.

3a. *janjiq* 'promise'

(6a) *Aku janjiq ie kèpèng*

'I promise him money'

-straightforward AV, with full arguments

(6b) *siq=ku janjiq ie kèpèng*

'I promised him money'

-straightforward PV version of (6a)

(6c) *Ie te-janjiq kèpèng*

'He was promised money'

-Passivized R here. Nisa says this one is perfectly fine.

(6d) *Ie te-janjiq-an kèpèng*

'He was promised money'

-Passived R, and with -an added to the verb. The addition of applicative -an to the passivized verb introduces a new wrinkle: "When I put -an, you gotta put the agent. There's a strong tendency to reveal who gave the promise". In other words, it seems that adding the applicative suffix requires re-introducing the downgraded agent, because -an is bringing another argument into the fray. So (6d) is OK as is, but it would be much better with the agent specified in a *siq*-phrase

- (7a) Nisa te-janjiq kèpèng
'Nisa was promised money'
-again, passivized R
- (7b) kèpèng te-janjiq Nisa
'Money was promised Nisa'
-passivized T
- (8a) le janjiq aku kèpèng
'He promised me money'
-straightforward AV construction. This shows that there is no forced passive in Ampenan Sasak: Having a 3rd-person A and a 1st-person R did not force a passive construction.
- (8b) siq=ne janjiq=ku kèpèng
'he promised me money'
-here's the PV equivalent of (8a), and the R is even cliticized onto the verb. Again, no forced passive
- (8c) kèpèng te-janjiq=ku
'money was promised me'
-Here T is passived. For some reason, Nisa prefers having the 1st-person pronoun *aku* cliticized onto the verb. Right now, I'm not sure what the cause is for that.
- (8d) *kèpèng te-janjiq aku
'money was promised me'
-compare to (8c): The sentence is much less acceptable with the full pronoun for *aku*
- (8e) Aku te-janjiq(-an) kèpèng (siq ie)
'I was promised'
-Passivized R. The addition of -an to the verb means you should have the A in the *siq*-phrase at the end

3b. **towoq 'feed (by hand)'**

- (9a) aku towoq anak=ku buboh
'I fed my baby porridge'
-straightforward AV construction. The =ku on child is a possessive morpheme.
- (9b) inaq=ku towoq anak=ku buboh
'My mother fed my baby porridge'
-straightforward AV construction. Again, the =ku morphemes are possessives.
- (9c) aku towoq kanak no buboh
'I fed the child some porridge'
-straightforward AV construction, without any =ku morphology

(10a) anak=ku te-towoq buboh
My baby was fed porridge
-passivized R from (9a). Works perfectly fine.

(10b) kanak no te-towoq buaq
The child was fed fruit
-another passivized R.

(10c) Buboh te-towoq anak=ku siq inaq=ku
Porridge was fed my baby by my mother
-passivized T

3b. *peritoq* 'show'

(11a) aku peritoq kamu poto no
'I show you the picture'
-Straight-forward AV here. Nisa says this sentence without applicative suffix -an on the verb. However, she said without the -an, "the kamu is not as strong as ..." She didn't quite elaborate, but I think it seems like the T is more prominent, and she's saying that -an helps to emphasize the R.

(11b) aku peritoq-an kamu poto no
'aku peritoq-an kamu poto no
-With the addition of -an to (11a) here, Nisa says the T and the R (the photo and *kamu*) are "equally significant". I'm not quite sure why she didn't push to include an overt agent here, with the addition of -an.

(12a) Kamu te-peritoq poto no
'You were shown a picture'
-Here it's OK to passivize R.

(12b) Kamu te-peritoq(-an) poto no siq Udin
'You were shown a picture'
Again R is passivized. Nisa says both (12a) and (12b) are OK, but she seems to prefer (12b), which has both -an and an overt agent specified

(12c) Poto no te-peritoq-an Udin siq Nisa
A picture was shown Udin by Nisa
-Likewise, passivized T is OK, but the inclusion of -an and the overt agent are preferred

4. Relativization of R and T in other underived ditransitives

(13a) Dengan no gitaq dagang no
'The man saw the seller'

-setting the stage with a straightforward AV construction

- (13b) Né **dengan** saq gitaq dagang no
 DEM person REL see seller DEM

'This is the man who saw the seller'

-here A is relativized from the AV embedded clause

- (13c) *Né **dagang** [saq dengan no gitaq]

'This is the seller who the man saw'

-I tried to relativize the P from the AV embedded clause here. Nisa cringed and said it's "not really good ... it's SO bad"

- (13d) Né **dagang** saq siq=ne gitaq siq dengan no

'This is the seller who the man saw'

-However, in contrast to (13c), if the embedded clause is in PV, then the P can be extracted. The =ne in the RC refers to the A

- (14a) siq=ne gitaq dagang no (siq dengan no)

'The man saw the seller'

-Setting up the main clause as a PV construction here. It's OK to have 'man' as =ne is referent established in discourse.

- (14b) *Né dengan saq siq=ne gitaq dagang no

'This is the man who saw the seller'

-it's no good to try to relativize an A from a PV clause

- (14c) *Né siq dengan saq siq=ne gitaq dagang no

'This is the man who saw the seller'

-again, it's no good to try to relativize the A from a PV clause. Here the siq-phrase with the full NP has been extracted from (14a), and the siq=ne has been included

- (14d) *Né siq dengan saq gitaq dagang no

'This is the man who saw the seller'

-again, it's no good to try to relativize the A from a PV clause. Here the siq-phrase with the full NP has been extracted from (14a), and the siq=ne has been omitted

- (14e) Né dagang saq siq=ne gitaq siq dengan no

'This is the seller who the man saw'

-but it's perfectly fine to relativize the P from a PV embedded clause

5. Passivization + relativization of P

- (15a) Dagang no te-gitaq siq dengan no

'The seller was seen by the man'

-passivization of the P from (13a). Everything's OK so far.

- (15b) Né dagang saq te-gitaq siq dengan no
 'This is the seller who was seen by the man'
 -Here the P is passivized and then relativized. Works fine.
- (15c) *Né siq dengan saq dagang no te-gitaq
 This is the man who the seller was seen by
 -as expected, you can't passivize and then extract the A from (13a)
- (15d) *Né dengan saq dagang no te-gitaq siq
 This is the man who the seller was seen by
 -Again, as expected, you can't passivize and then extract the A from (13a)

6. More relativization with underived ditransitives

- (16a) Aku janjiq dagang no kèpèng
 'I promise the seller money'
 -setting the stage with an AV construction
- (16b) Aku gitaq dagang [saq=ku janjiq kèpèng no]
 'I see the seller who I promised money'
 -Relativized R from an AV embedded clause. Nisa says this one's OK, but it "feels better with siq" as in (16c)
- (16c) Aku gitaq dagang [saq siq=ku janjiq kèpèng no]
 'I saw the seller who I promised money'
 -Here we have the relativized R from the PV version of the embedded clause in (16b). Nisa prefers to extract R from PV clauses rather than AV clauses.
- (16d) Aku gitaq dagang [saq=ne janjiq kèpèng siq Udin no]
 'I saw the seller who Udin promised the money'
 -trying a different A in the embedded clause. Here it's OK to extract the R from a OV embedded clause, where =ne indexes Udin and is cliticize to the relativizer
- (16e) Aku gitaq dagang [saq janjiq=ne kèpèng siq Udin no]
 'I saw the seller who Udin promised the money'
 -This is the same as (16d), only the clitic attached to the verb instead of the relativizer
- (16f) Aku gitaq dagang saq Udin janjiq kèpèng no
 'I saw the seller who Udin promised the money'
 -Here the R is extracted from an AV embedded clause. Nisa says this one is not as good as (16d-e), which has OV embedded clauses.

- (16g) Aku gitaq dagang saq kamu janjiq kèpèng no
 'I saw the seller who you promised money'
 -Here the R is extracted from an AV clause. I think this one was OK, but I'm not sure.
- (16h) Aku gitaq dagang saq=de janjiq kèpèng no
 'I saw the seller who you promised money'
 -Here Nisa said this one was OK. Possibly, this gets at the ambiguous structure of some clauses, where you have a cliticized agent, but it could be AV or PV. The =de is clitic version of honorific form of *side* 'you'
- (16i) wah=ku kadu kèpèng saq=ku janjiq side no
 'I already spent the money I promised the seller'
 -Relativized T here. Again, this one seemed OK, but I'm wondering if that's because the embedded clause is ambiguously AV/PV.
- (17a) Aku beli meong
 'I bought a cat'
 -just a straightforward AV transitive, setting the stage with a new verb *beli* 'buy'
- (17b) Aku beli meong [saq=ku peritoq kanak no]
 'I bought the cat that I showed the child'
 -relativized/extracted T here is OK. Again, I'm wondering if that's because the embedded clause is ambiguously AV/PV.
- (17c) Aku beli meong saq inaq=ku peritoq kanak no
 'I bought the cat that my mother showed the child'
 -Here the T is extracted from an AV ditransitive clause. Nisa didn't object terribly strongly, but she definitely prefers extracting the T from the PV clause in (17d)
- (17d) Aku beli meong saq siq=ne peritoq kanak no siq inaq=ku
 'I bought the cat that the mother showed the child'
 -T extracted from a PV embedded clause is preferred. Compared to (17c), Nisa says "I like the last one" (this one)